



Finglass, P. J. (2007). Unpublished emendations by Peter Elmsley on Euripides and Aristophanes. *Classical Quarterly*, 57(2), 742-746.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000663>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1017/S0009838807000663](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000663)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the accepted author manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Cambridge University Press at <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000663>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

UNPUBLISHED EMENDATIONS BY PETER ELMSLEY ON EURIPIDES AND ARISTOPHANES

Several books once owned by the English classicist Peter Elmsley (1774-1825) are now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. Some contain extensive annotations in Elmsley's hand. These are written in different inks (sometimes in pencil), which indicates (as we might have expected) that they were not all composed in a single sitting. No dates are given, however. Almost all the notes are emendations. Much of the material contained in these marginalia was published by Elmsley during his lifetime, in his own printed editions or in reviews of the editions of others. But some of it has never previously appeared. Of the unpublished emendations, several can be immediately discarded because they have subsequently been found in manuscripts, or were anticipated by scholars writing before Elmsley. Other emendations were made by Elmsley's contemporaries or successors, or do not appear to have been made before. It is with these that I am concerned.

The most interesting volumes are both dated to 1806: anonymous editions of Euripides' *Electra* (Auct. S inf. 1.11)ⁱ and *Alcestis* (Auct. S inf. 1.12)ⁱⁱ, published at Oxford for use in Westminster School, Elmsley's *alma mater*.ⁱⁱⁱ The catalogues of the Bodleian and British libraries attribute the *Electra* edition to Peter Elmsley, although there is no external evidence to support this.^{iv} Recent editors of Euripides' *Electra*^v do not refer to the book, although it contains one emendation which they attribute to a later scholar, F. A. Paley (at line 1141, *dai/mosin qu/ein se xrh/* in place of transmitted *xrh/se dai/mosin qu/h*). This should now be awarded to 'anon., fort. Elmsley'. Apart from

this there are no significant printed emendations in the book. The *Alcestis* edition is attributed to Thomas Gaisford in the British Library catalogue and to Elmsley in the Durham catalogue. The former is almost certainly correct, as J. H. Monk also attributes the edition to Gaisford in his edition of the *Alcestis* (Cambridge, 1816).

The *Electra* contains 32 emendations, the *Alcestis* 16. These exclude readings which were (a) already proposed by earlier scholars, (b) later published by Elmsley himself or (c) which have subsequently been found in mediaeval manuscripts. They fall into three categories, listed below. I have marked with an asterisk those emendations which Diggle accepts into his text. I begin with the *Electra*.^{vi}

(i) 7 are attributed to a scholar who postdates Elmsley: 7 g 0 e1qhke (R. Haupt, who has *e1qhke), 14 e1leip 0 (Paley), 22 pai=d 0 u9p 0 (Paley), *117 Tunda/rew (Dindorf), 315 e3draisin 0Asia/dej (Zuntz)^{vii}, 490 po/da (Diggle), *776 kaino\j (Kvicala – THE ‘c’ IN THIS NAME SHOULD HAVE A SMALL ‘v’ ON TOP).

(ii) 12 are attributed to a scholar contemporary with Elmsley: *19 h4 (Seidler 1813), *27 sfe bouleu/santoj (Seidler), *121 zo/aj (Hermann 1816), *324 ou1pw xoa/j pot 0 (Porson 1807), *374 ta1ra (Seidler), *513 oi]n (Schaefer 1811), *548 e0re/sqai (Matthiae 1815), 672 oi1kteiron (Dobree), 685 ktanei=n (Seidler), 1117 kai\ su/ g 0 (Blomfield), *1148 <e0n> (Seidler), *1207 fonai=sin (Seidler).

(iii) 13 are unattributed: 8 hu0tu/xhsen, 23 ei]xe nin, 122 Ai3da (0Ai/da Hermann 1816), 243 tw~nd 0 e1t 0, 442 Eu0bw|~daj (Eu0boi=daj Seidler), 571 pai=da, 751 ei1xomen, 793 o9 d 0, 967 ou0 (for h]), 972 h]n, 1106 e1pi, 1149 a0rxe/laj, 1250 se pto/lin.

And for the *Alcestis*:

(i) None is attributed to a scholar postdating Elmsley.

(ii) 11 are attributed to a scholar contemporary with Elmsley: 34 sfh/lanta (Monk 1816)^{viii}, *49 xrh|= (Schaefer), *118 a0po/tomoj (Blomfield, *ap.* Monk 1816), 206 ta/sd 0 (Lenting *teste* Wecklein)^{ix}, *229 pela/ssai (Erfurdt), 523 moi=ran (Blaydes)^x, 674 a1nac (for w} pai=; Monk 1816 has w}nac), 795 pi/ei (Herwerden *teste* Wecklein)^{xi}, *1002 prou/qan 0 (Monk 1816), 1110 do/mouj (Monk 1816), 1119 nin (for nai/) (Weil)^{xii}.

(iii) 5 are unattributed: 64 kai\ (for h]), 329 e0moi\, 342 a9marta/nonta, 347 me (for mou), 625 pai=d 0 (for to/nd 0).

These emendations could have been made at any point between 1806 (the publication date of the editions) and 1825 (the date of Elmsley's death). Three marginal emendations which Elmsley subsequently published appeared in the years 1812, 1813 and 1814, although this need not mean that the others must come from before this period. However, the fact that many of Elmsley's other published emendations on the text of these plays do not find a place in his marginalia may suggest an earlier rather than a later date for these notes. In the case of group (ii), it is unlikely that Elmsley took the emendations from the published works of those scholars who are traditionally credited with them. If he were doing that, he would most likely have included many more, given the great number of excellent emendations which, say, Seidler included in

his edition (cf. e.g. his palmary tako/man for ta\n ko/man at *El.* 1209^{xiii}). Since we do not know whether Elmsley had priority in the case of any given emendation, all those in group (ii) should now be attributed to him as well as to their traditional author. The emendations in group (i) can all be awarded to Elmsley, except that at *Electra* line 7 our apparatus should read ‘e1qhke R. Haupt (g 0 e1qhke iam Elmsley)’.

What of the new emendations, those in group (iii)? None is certain. Some are best forgotten, such as *El.* 1149 a0rxe/laj. But several are attractive without being compelling, such as *El.* 751 ei1xomen, 967 ou0. It would be surprising if none of them found at least a place in the apparatus of a future edition.

I take the remaining Euripidean volumes in order of publication, followed by an edition of Aristophanes. Again, an asterisk before an emendation means that Diggle prints it in his text, or, for Aristophanes, that N. G. Wilson prints it in his forthcoming Oxford Classical Text. Groups (i) and (ii) refer to emendations made by scholars after Elmsley and contemporary with Elmsley respectively. Emendations in the former should henceforth be attributed to Elmsley alone, and those in the latter to Elmsley as well as to their traditional author.

1. Auct. S. infr. 1.10: R. Porson (ed.), *Euripidis Hecuba* (Cambridge, 1802), *Euripidis Orestes* (London, 1798), *Euripidis Phoenissae* (London, 1799), *Euripidis Medea* (London, 1801).

(i) *Or.* *793 to\ d 0 (Paley), 1578 ktenei=n (Wecklein).

(ii) *Phoen.* *423 ka1dwke/ g 0 (Schaefer)^{xiv}, *Med.* *753 e0mmenei=n (Lenting)^{xv}, *1281 o4n (Seidler 1811)^{xvi}, *1290 dh=t 0 (Hermann)^{xvii}.

2. Auct. S. infr. 1.13: R. Porson (ed.), *Euripidis Hecuba* (London, 1808), *Euripidis Orestes* (London, 1811), *Euripidis Phoenissae* (London, 1811), *Euripidis Medea* (London, 1812).

(i) *Phoen.* 927 dh=ta (Wecklein).

(ii) *Or.* 701 qe/loij (Schaefer 1824), 737 ei0ko\j h]n (Seager, denuo Hermann), *1527 s 0 a2n (Monk), *Phoen.* *345 mate/ri (Seidler (n. 16), i. 90), *1710 xe/ra (Hermann)^{xviii}, *1746 sko/tia (Hermann)^{xix}.

This volume also includes *Phoen.* *423 ka1dwke/ g 0 (Schaefer), and *Med.* *1290 dh=t 0 (Hermann), which are in Auct. S. infr. 1.10.

3. Auct. S. infr. 1.14: J. Markland (ed.), *Euripidis Supplices Mulieres* (Oxford, 1811) and *Euripidis Iphigenia in Aulide et in Tauris* (Oxford, 1811).

(i) *IT* 468 toi=n ce/noin (Diggle), *IA* 84 dh=ta (Nauck, noluit Markland), 967 e0strateu/omen (Monk)^{xx}, 1026 poi= (Wecklein).

4. Auct. S. infr. 1.18: P. Invernizi (ed.), *Aristophanis Comoediae* (Leipzig, 1794).

- (i) *Eq.* *1270 <a0ei\> (Dindorf), *Vesp.* *665-6 speaker attributions (Liston)^{xxi},
Eccl. *367 a9nh\r (Reisig).
- (ii) *Vesp.* *1262 ta1r 0 (in fact ta]r 0) (Hermann)^{xxii}, *Av.* *1438 toi (Dobree)^{xxiii}.

This volume contains an emendation on the *Acharnians* which is also found in Elmsley's 1809 edition of the play: namely, a9nh\r at 494 (written a9 0nh\r), which is attributed to van Leeuwen in S. D. Olson's recent commentary (Oxford, 2002).^{xxiv}

Elmsley's papers also include two sets of notes preparatory to an edition of the *Helen*.^{xxv} In the former we find the emendation e0xqi/sthj at line *72, which Diggle attributes to Dingelstad.^{xxvi} In a letter to Blomfield written on 8th February 1813^{xxvii} Elmsley says that he is preparing an edition of the *Helen* similar to that of his *Heracidae*, so the notes probably date to around that time.^{xxviii}

All Souls College, Oxford

P. J. FINGLASS

patrick.finglass@all-souls.ox.ac.uk

ⁱ Euripidou Elektra. Euripidis Electra. Ex editione Musgravii. Cum variarum lectionum delectu, in usum Scholæ Regiæ Westmonasteriensis. Oxonii: e Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1806. 63 pages.

ⁱⁱ Euripidou Alkestis. Euripidis Alcestis ex optimis exemplaribus expressa. Cum variis lectionibus, in usum Scholæ Regiæ Westmonasteriensis. Oxonii: e typographeo Clarendoniano, MDCCCVI. 59 pages.

ⁱⁱⁱ Apart from the volumes at Oxford, copies of the plays can be found in the British Library, London (*Electra*: 995.f.21.(2.), 995.f.21.(3.); *Alcestis*: 995.f.21.(3.)), the Palace Green Library, Durham (*Electra*: Routh 21.D. 24; *Alcestis*: Routh 21.D.23), the Cambridge University Library (*Alcestis*: Rare Books Room 8700.d.1314), and the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München (*Electra*: BV001420394). In the United States copies of the *Electra* volume are held by the College of William and Mary, Virginia (881 E8d 1806), Sewanee: The University of the South, Tennessee (PA3973.E5 1806) and Brigham Young University, Utah (Harold B. Lee Library, PA 3462 .W34x 1844). I owe my knowledge of the American copies to Dr Christopher Stray.

^{iv} Elmsley's chief scholarly concern at this period was his edition of Sophocles, published in Edinburgh in 1805 or shortly afterwards, and of which only one copy survives (see my article 'A newly-discovered edition of Sophocles by Peter Elmsley', *GRBS* 47 (2007)). But he was also working on Euripides. In a letter to his old friend Charles Watkin Williams Wynn (1775-1850), written at Edinburgh on 10th June 1803, he says 'I have finished the text of Sophocles. and am employed in the notes, or rather, various readings. I have printed an Edition of the Medea of Euripides, by way of experiment, with many alterations in the orthography. Among others I mark the long vowels (A, I, U.) whenever they occur. The printers have not the common mark a, e, i, o, u [[ALL WITH LONG MARKS ON TOP]] united to Greek characters, for which reasons I am forced to use the soft spirit, of which I make no other use. This will appear uncouth to the eye, but in a single play it is of no consequence' (National Library of Wales, Coed y Maen bundle no. 10 (92 letters, dating 1796-1824, numbered 776-869), letter 792). Elmsley later

published an edition of the *Medea* in Oxford in 1818 (2nd edition 1828). The preface makes no reference to an earlier version, nor have I found any mention of it elsewhere.

^v J. Diggle (ed.), *Euripidis Fabulae. Tomus II* (Oxford, 1981); G. Basta Donzelli (ed.), *Euripides. Electra*, (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1995).

^{vi} Donzelli's edition provides the precise place of publication for many of these conjectures.

^{vii} G. Zuntz, 'Eine Anmerkung zu Aischylos' "Persern": 0Asi/j oder 0Asia/j?', *Philologus* 127 (1983), 293-5, at 294-5. I owe this reference to Professor James Diggle.

^{viii} See J. Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981), 44.

^{ix} R. Prinz (ed.), *Euripidis Alcestis, editio altera quam curavit N. Wecklein* (Leipzig, 1899), 52. I have not found the conjecture in J. Lenting, *Epistola Critica in Euripidis Alcestin* (Zutphen, 1821).

^x F. H. M. Blaydes, *Miscellanea Critica* (Halle, 1907), 255.

^{xi} R. Prinz (ed.), *Euripidis Alcestis, editio altera quam curavit N. Wecklein* (Leipzig, 1899), 57.

^{xii} H. Weil (ed.), *Euripidis. Alceste* (Paris, 1891).

^{xiii} First published in 'Epistola Critica Seidleri', *ap.* C. A. Lobeck (ed.) *Sophoclis Ajax graece* (Leipzig 1809), 433-40, at 438. The letter is dated May 1809, and is not reprinted in Lobeck's two subsequent editions.

^{xiv} R. Porson (ed.), *Euripidis Hecuba, Orestes, Phoenissae et Medea* (Leipzig, 1824) (with notes by G. H. Schaefer).

^{xv} J. Lenting (ed.), *Euripidis Medea* (Zutphen, 1819).

^{xvi} J. F. A. Seidler, *De versibus dochmiacis tragicorum Graecorum* (2 vols.; Leipzig, 1811-12), i. 155-6.

^{xvii} J. G. J. Hermann (ed.), *Euripidis Medea* (Leipzig, 1822).

^{xviii} J. G. J. Hermann, *Elementa Doctrinae Metricae* (Leipzig, 1816), 761.

^{xix} In A. Matthiae (ed.), *Euripidis Tragoediae et Fragmenta* (10 vols.; Leipzig, 1813-37), i. 239 (1813) (emendation in text), vi. 416 (1821) (emendation attributed to Hermann).

^{xx} J. H. Monk (ed.), *Euripidis Iphigenia in Aulide* (Cambridge, 1840).

^{xxi} H. Liston, 'Notes on the *Vespa* of Aristophanes. Part II.', *Classical Journal* vol. 32 no. 63 (September, 1825), 40-6, at 44-5.

^{xxii} J. G. J. Hermann (ed.), *Orphica* (Leipzig, 1805), on *Argonautica* 1176 (p. 216).

^{xxiii} P. P. Dobree, *Adversaria* (2 vols.; ed. J. Scholefield; Cambridge, 1833-43), ii. 229.

^{xxiv} Elmsley also adopts α9nh\r (which he prints α9 0nh\r) at *Ach.* 423 and 479 (in his printed edition and in his marginalia to *Invernizi*), but in these cases he is anticipated by Bentley ('Bentleii emendationes ineditae in Aristophanem No. IV', *The Classical Journal* vol. 12 (no. 24), December 1815, 352-66, at 362) and Brunck (his edition, Strasbourg 1783) respectively (I owe these references to Professor Colin Austin). Bentley advocates w)nh\r, while Brunck prints w(0nh\r: both of these are simply different ways of representing crasis of ο9 + α0nh\r. Olson attributes these changes to Ribbeck *duce Bentleio* and van Leeuwen respectively (noting in the latter that Brunck has w(nh\r).

^{xxv} Bodley MS Clar. Press d. 28 (fols. 267-364) and 30 (130-82, 215-318).

^{xxvi} H. Dingelstad, *De Euripidis Helena* (Munich, 1865), 51. I am grateful to Miss Claire Wilkinson for checking this reference for me in the Cambridge University Library.

^{xxvii} Bodley MS Autogr. d. 24 150-1.

^{xxviii} I am grateful to Professor Christopher Collard, Professor James Diggle, and Mr Nigel Wilson for helpful comments; and to Professor Colin Austin, Dr Christopher Stray and Miss Claire Wilkinson for assistance acknowledged in earlier notes.